CENTER ROUTING SLIP

TSG			19 August 1970
то	INITIAL	SDATE	REMARKS
DIRECTOR			I have sent copies of the
DEP/DIRECTOR	2 (2/20	attached to
XEC/DIRE CTOR	1 20	8/15	Legislative Counsel and
PECIAL ASST		' ,	structed.
SST TO DIR	3 TDC	8/21	structed.
IISTORIAN	ープン	1	
H/PPBS	*	-	Bala
DEP CH/PPBS		1	
XO/PPBS			Vine_
	-+ -		
CH/SS	•	1	3 5-
DEP CH/SS		-	
SC & P			
RECORDS MGT			
PERSONNEL		_	
LOGISTICS			
TRAINING			
SECURITY		1	
FINANCE		<u> </u>	
	İ	1	
CH/IEG	İ		
DEP CH/IEG		1	
EXO/IEG			
·	İ		·
CH, PSG			
DEP CH PSG	·		
EXO PSG			
CH/TSG			DECLASS DEVIEW by NCA
DEP CH/ TSG			DECLASS REVIEW by NGA
EXO/TSG			
DIR/IAS/DDI			
CH/DIAXX-4			
CH/ DIAAP-9	_		 26 : CIA-RDP78B05703A000200010

25X1

Approved For Release 2004/03/26 CIA-RDP78B05703A000200010024-7

DRAFT

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD	
SUBJECT: Discussion of the Prototype 1540 Light Table	25X1
1. On 18 August 1970, a meeting was held into discus	ss 25X1
the evaluation of the prototype 1540 Model II Light Table. In	25X1
attendance were:	
NPIC -	25X1
	25X1
	_ <u> </u> ,
2. opened the meeting by stating that the	25X1
had requested the meeting. He asked if had specifi	ic 25X1
questions they wished to have answered stated that	25X1
he had questions on the short comings of their equipment:	
a. In what ways were the systems and subsystems of the	25X1
Table deficient? How were they relative to thetable?	25X1
b. In the evaluation of the tables, was past performance of t	the
companies rated? Did managerial, technical, or any other factors	
influence the evaluation?	
c. He had questions on the equality of the evaluation. He	
stated he heard rumors about the evaluation.	
d. Is the Table built to the same specifications as the	
table?	

25X1

25X1

25X1

Approved For Release 2004/03/26 : CIA-RDP78B05703A000200010024-7

	SUBJECT: Discussion of the Prototype 15140 Light Table	25X1
25X1	e. Was allowed to make more corrections to their table	
	during the evaluation period?	
25X1	f. Was the table over engineered and if so, was this	
	brought out at the critique.	
25X1	pointed out that his organization carried out a	
	quantitative evaluation and not a subjective one. suggested	25X1
A Secure Secure	that it might answer most of the questions if briefed on his	25X1
	evaluation of the fixes made to the table. gave the	25X1
	same briefing he gave the Executive Director, NPIC, on 4 August. He	
	stated that the deficiencies had been corrected with the exception of:	
	a. Excessive temperature at the film plane after 4.5 hours	
	operation with 2.0 density film.	
	b. Rate control of the carriage movement was still too high.	
	c. Dirt still got under the glass.	
25X1	4. said they would like to know what must be done	
	to improve the equipment and make it competitive. stated	25X1
	that we would be glad to discuss the short comings and corrections to the	
25X1	table but would not give a comparison of systems and subsystems	
25X1	of the tables. He explained that a time problem existed	
	during the evaluation period and the Center made an engineering judgement	
	of which table came closest to meeting specifications and the PI needs.	
	He stated that both tables did not totally meet specs and that the short	
	comings were reviewed with T&E and TEG and the decision had to be made on	

. • • • •	•	Approved For Release 2004/03/26 CIA-RDP 78B05703A000200010024-7	
		SUBJECT: Discussion of the Prototype 1540 Light Table	25X1
		a time basis. He stated that if the had initially contained all	25X1
:		these "fixes" it could have influenced our decision.	
25X1		5. asked when the decision was made to go with	
25X1		said it would be difficult to answer since there are	
		many decision points in our procurement cycle. This varies from the	
22. 4 . a. 25.		operational request to the executive sign off. He thought it might have	
25X1	÷	occurred in June. stated that they had demonstrated	
		some fixes in April and some in mid-June. He asked if the decision had	
A Charles and Char		been made prior to mid-June. stated that due to our	25X1
6		procurement cycle, the decision had to be made prior to the end of June	
•		and technical and cost considerations both entered the picture. He said	
		he would not hazard a guess if present table and different price	25X1
i 1 :		would have won the competition. said they ran operational	25X1
	·	tests on both tables in March and April. The PIs felt they could	
		immediately go to work on the table but they desired further features.	25X1
		The PIs felt they could not do this with the table.	25X1
25X1		6. was allowed in more frequently	
25X1		for repairs. silad he could not state how many times each	
		company was in for repairs. He stated that the ground rules were that a	
		contractor would be allowed in for repairs only if the malfunction would	
		cause the termination of the T&E testsstated that 8 series	25X1
		of PIs were used in the operational tests. There was very little down	
1		time for either toble. Cost information was withhold and only the	

Approved For Release 2004/03/26 : CIA-RDP78B05703A000200010024-7

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

SUBJECT: Discussion of the Prototype 1540 Light Table	25X1
operation of the table was used in the evaluation.	25X1
asked what items prevented thetable being used immediately.	25X1
stated that the film drives, the heat problem, and the film	
tracking prevented its immediate use.	
7 stated that the over temperature of the drive	
-systems was caused by a failure of a component that was allowed to remain	•
uncorrected during the evaluation period. He thought this might have	
seriously affected the evaluation stated this was not the	25X1
case. A list was made of all the faults and a description made of the	
seriousness of the fault. In all cases, faults had detailed rationales	
as to their seriousness. Heat in PI space did not alone reject the table.	
stated that the 70 mm tracking was a very serious problem	
during the operational evaluation. I stated this did not	25X1
occur initially at the plant. The first knew of this	25X1
was when the table was returned toafter the critique. Mr.	25X1
stated that we have to assume that the table is in proper working	
order and ready for evaluation when it is delivered to us.	
8. was asked in more often during	
the T&E. stated that they were not asked in more as far as	
he is aware. stated that had one recuring problem and	25X1
two problem areas did not know the dates and number	25X1
of visits. He said worked on the carriage drives several times when	
it stopped the tests but that was not allowed to make other fixes	25X1
during these visits	,

Approved For Release 2004/03/26: CIA-RDP78B05703A000200010024-7

	SUBJECT: Discussion of the Prototype 1500 Light Table	25X1
25X1	9. asked if any other groups had been involved	
25X1	in the evaluation. stated that we brokered the evaluation	
	for the Community through our TOC and operational people.	
25X1	10. said he is still at a loss to get a hold on	
and the second	the situation. He asked what it is about thetable that is not	25×1
	satisfactory or is less satisfactory than thetable. He said	25X1
e de la composition della comp	needed to learn what you are not happy with and what makes the	25X1
25X1	table "less good". stated that this had been pretty well	
25X1	covered by telling what was wrong and by	25X1
	explaining the time frame.	
25X1	11. asked what does the Center prefer in a table	
25X1	beyond the specs. explained that no one table could please	
	every PI but that the PI could not possibly live with thetable	25X1
	as it was during the operational evaluation.	
25X1	stated that if they could have looked at the	25X1
	table prior to 4 May, certain fixes might have been made.	
	stated that they were provided a critique once the T&E had been completed	
	but that there had been some procrastination on part in responding	ւՁ5 X1
	to fixes to the problems highlighted at the critique.	
25X1 25X1	13. stated that the tracking problem was not clear at	25X1
20/(1	the critique, and that it was the number one item addressed on the	
	List of Fixes, dated 24 Mayalso stated that it was	25X1
	discussed at the critique. stated that the tracking and	25X1
4	hunting problem had not been corrected in late June.	. •

Approved For Release 2004/03/26 : CIA-RDP78B05705A000200010024-7

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1.

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

SUBJECT: Discussion of the Prototype 1540 Light Table	25X1
14. stated that it sounds like the Center has	
thoroughly evaluated the tables. Can you compare the major areas of	
both tables so knows where to improve their table.	25X1
stated that we have given you an evaluation of the short comings of your	
table, and that a comparison of the tables is not needed.	
asked what weight was given to past performance	•
stated that the green oil and the leaks could not have come	
at a worse time but that we had accepted explanation. Mr.	25X1
table had been over engineered and	
had too many frills. sAad he saw a picture of the table	25X1
and thinks that had a more polished job. stated	25X1
that the added items may have given the table added points in	25X1
the evaluation. stated that the overall outward appearance	
of the table was better.	
stated they are trying to answer for them-	
selves the great difference in cost for the tables. Did frills con-	
tribute to these costs. stated that there were many in-	
tangible differences between the tables. said intangibles	25X1
only entered the PI evaluation not the T&E. Both tables basically met	
specs but that the evaluation had to be time oriented.	
17. asked why the purchase was all one buy if tables	
were required by a certain date. stated that this had been	25X1
· L	

CONFIDENTIAL Approved For Release 2004/03/26 : CIA-RDP78B05703A000200010024-7

:	SUBJECT: Discussion of the Prototype 1540 Light Table	25X1
25X1	aired and discussed. If could not have met the production schedule	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	there might have been a split order. He further stated that the T&E	
	report will be distributed throughout the Community and it will state	
	that the fixes have been made to the table.	25X1
25X1 ⁻	18. stated that one point has not been covered.	
25X1	built a prototype at a great loss and a competitor was provided	
-	the information free. The competitor is rumored to have received 2 to 3	
41 July have your	times as much money for the development stated this was	25X1
and the control of th	not true-that the amount spent on Contractor for total development was	
25X1	within He further stated that we were not buying competition.	
25X1	He also stated that would have to answer any questions on	
	contracting.	
25X1	19. said the only question he raises is evaluating	
25X1	the table without correcting the temperature problem. Mr.	
25X1	stated that people realized the table does not ordinarily operate	
20/(1	this hot.	
25X1	20. thanked the group for their time and infor-	
25X1	mation. reiterated that the T&E report on the tables and	
	the corrections will go out to the entire community.	
		25V1
1		25X1